



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/825,578	04/15/2004	Andrew Aaron	728-242	8668
66668 7590 08/15/2008 THE FARRELL LAW FIRM - IBM 333 EARLE OVINGTON BOULEVARD SUITE 701 UNIONDALE, NY 11553				
EXAMINER				
NEWAY, SAMUEL G				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2626				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/15/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/825,578

Applicant(s)

AARON ET AL.

Examiner

Samuel G. Neway

Art Unit

2626

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 June 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 9-15 and 18-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 9-15 and 18-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SI/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is responsive to the Amendment after Non-Final filed on 13 June 2008
2. Claims 1 – 7, 9 – 15, and 18 – 23 are pending and considered below.

Response to Amendment

3. The Objection to the Specification is withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 – 7, 9 – 15, and 18 – 23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Objections

5. Claims 1 – 7 are objected to because of the following informalities: independent claim 1 recites "inserting a variable length pause before and after output of the synthesized speech". It is believed this should read, and will be treated as, 'inserting a variable length pause before and after the output of the synthesized speech'. Claims 2 – 7 are objected to because they depend upon claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1 – 3, 9 – 11, 18, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brittan et al (US PGPub 2002/0184030), in view of Koyama et al ("A Highly Intelligible Speech Synthesis for Banking Services in Financial Network System ANSER", Interactive Voice Technology for Telecommunications Applications, 1998. IVTTA '98. Proceedings), and in further view of Tarlton et al (US PGPub 2005/0027523).

Claim 1:

Brittan discloses a method for improving the intelligibility of speech output by a speech synthesizer (Abstract), comprising the steps of:

determining if uncommon words exist in a text; and if it is determined that an uncommon word exists in the text, inserting a pause before ("insert pauses in front of certain words", [0065]) and after ("a pause inserted at the end of the dubious utterance", [0090]) the output of the synthesized speech of the uncommon word to offset the uncommon word from its surrounding speech ("insert pauses in front of certain words, such as non-dictionary words and other specialized terms and proper nouns (there being a natural human tendency to do this)", [0065]. Note that the non-dictionary words, the specialized terms, and the proper nouns are determined before a pause is inserted).

Brittan does not explicitly disclose inserting a pause within the output of the synthesized word as claimed.

In a similar speech synthesis system, Koyama discloses inserting a pause within the output of a synthesized word inherently increasing the duration of the word (page 88, section B and also Fig. 3).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to insert a pause in the output of Brittan's synthesized uncommon word in order to "provide understandable synthesized speech" (Koyama, page 88, section B).

Brittan and Koyama do not explicitly disclose where the pauses inserted in the synthesized words have variable lengths.

In a similar speech synthesis system, Tarlton discloses inserting pauses with variable lengths ("the spoken language system 100 ... can lengthen the correction pause dynamically", [0026]).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to vary the length of the pauses in Brittan's system in order to allow users enough time to make corrections of misrecognized uncommon words (see Tarlton, [0025] and Brittan, [0090]).

Claim 2:

Brittan, Koyama, and Tarlton disclose the method of claim 1, Brittan further discloses wherein the determination is made by comparing the input text to common words stored in a database and determining if a word is uncommon if the word is not in the database (" ... such as non-dictionary words ... ", [0065]).

Claim 3:

Brittan, Koyama, and Tarlton disclose the method of claim 1, Brittan further discloses wherein a word is determined as uncommon if the word is capitalized (“... proper nouns ...”), [0065]).

Claims 9 – 11:

System claims 9 – 11 and method claims 1 – 3 are related as system and the method of using same, with each claimed element’s function corresponding to the claimed method step. Accordingly claims 9 – 11 are rejected with the same rationale as applied above with respect to method claims 1 – 3.

Claims 18, 19:

Brittan, Koyama, and Tarlton disclose the method of claims 1 and 3; Tarlton further discloses a computer program device readable by a machine embodying a program of instructions executable by the machine to perform the method steps of claims 1 and 3 ([0012]).

8. Claims 4 – 7, 12 – 15, and 20 – 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brittan et al (US PGPub 2002/0184030), in view of Koyama et al (“A Highly Intelligible Speech Synthesis for Banking Services in Financial Network System ANSER”, Interactive Voice Technology for Telecommunications Applications, 1998. IVTTA '98. Proceedings), in view of Tarlton et al (US PGPub 2005/0027523), and in further view of Lu et al (USPN 5,819,260).

Claims 4 and 5:

Brittan, Koyama, and Tarlton disclose the method of claim 1, but they do not explicitly disclose wherein the determination is made by using a statistical language model which compares a calculated value with a threshold value and if the calculated value is less than the threshold value the word is determined as uncommon.

In a phrase recognition method, similar to Brittan's word determination, Lu processes phrases to determine frequency of occurrence (col. 4, lines 14-15).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to determine the frequency of occurrence of a word and label it as uncommon if the frequency is below a threshold because, by definition, uncommon words are rare.

Claims 6 and 7:

Brittan, Koyama, and Tarlton disclose the method of claim 1, but they do not explicitly disclose wherein the determination is made by using a prediction algorithm which compares a calculated value with a threshold value and if the calculated value is less than the threshold value the word is determined as uncommon.

In a phrase recognition method, similar to Brittan's word determination, Lu processes phrases to determine frequency of occurrence (col. 4, lines 14-15).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to determine the frequency of occurrence of a word and label it as uncommon if the frequency is below a threshold because, by definition, uncommon words are rare.

Claims 12 – 15:

System claims 12 – 15 and method claims 4 – 7 are related as system and the method of using same, with each claimed element's function corresponding to the

claimed method step. Accordingly claims 12 – 15 are rejected with the same rationale as applied above with respect to method claims 4 – 7.

Claims 20 – 23:

Brittan, Koyama, Tarlton, and Lu disclose the method of claims 12 – 15; Tarlton further discloses a computer program device readable by a machine embodying a program of instructions executable by the machine to perform the method steps of claims 12 – 15 ([0012]).

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Samuel G. Neway whose telephone number is 571-270-1058. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:30AM - 5:30PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David R Hudspeth can be reached on 571-272-7843. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/David R Hudspeth/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2626

/S. G. N./
Examiner, Art Unit 2626